

at all of issues that are not the subject of an objection. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985); Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d at 200. Nonetheless, a district judge is responsible for the final determination and outcome of the case, and accordingly the court has conducted a careful review of the magistrate judge's recommendation.

After such careful review, the court determines that the recommendation of the magistrate judge is fully consistent with and supported by current law. Further, the factual background and recitation of issues is supported by the applicable pleadings. In particular, the court takes note of the following portion of the magistrate judge's Memorandum and Recommendation:


While the Commissioner sets forth a compelling argument for why the additional medical records are consistent with the finding made by the ALJ for the period through March 31, 2012, it is not the role of the Court to make this type of factual inquiry at the first instance.

(ECF #16) (citation omitted). Based on such determinations, the court will fully affirm the Memorandum and Recommendation (#16) and grant relief in accordance therewith.

ORDER

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED that the Memorandum and Recommendation (#16) is **AFFIRMED**, plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment (#12) is **GRANTED**, defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment (#14) is **DENIED**, and this case is **REMANDED** for further consideration consistent with the Memorandum and Recommendation.

Signed: October 4, 2016



Max O. Cogburn Jr.